

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. CLAIM STATUS AND AMENDMENTS

Claims 12-22 were pending in this application when last examined.

Claims 12-16 were examined on the merits and stand rejected.

Claims 17-22 were withdrawn as non-elected subject matter.

Claim 12 is amended to clarify the claimed invention.

No new matter has been added.

II. FOREIGN PRIORITY

The Examiner is respectfully requested to fully acknowledge the claim for foreign priority by checking boxes 12(a)(1, 2, or 3) on the coversheet of the next response.

III. ENABLEMENT REJECTION

On pages 3-7 of the Office Action, claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification lacks enablement.

Applicants note that claim 12 has been amended to recite “An *in vitro* base conversion method of a DNA sequence.” Therefore, this rejection is overcome for reasons which are self-evident.

IV. OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

On pages 7-12, claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Grunert et al. in view of Moriya and Marron et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to the amended claims.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite “consisting” instead of “comprising”. Therefore, this rejection is overcome for reasons which are self-evident.

Applicants further note that Grunert et al. uses a mixture of + and – strands, which is obtained by denaturing a PCR product. This is the “SFHR method” as described in the present specification (page 1, line 7 from the bottom). In the Example and Comparative Example of the specification, data of the conventional SFHR method are shown (see Figure 4). Specifically, “dsHES” is a mixture of + and – strands, which is obtained by digesting double-stranded plasmid and denaturing (page 24, lines 6-7). Likewise, pcrHES is a mixture of + and – strands obtained by denaturing double-stranded PCR product (page 25, lines 7-16). As shown in Figure 4, the base conversion efficiency of the single stranded DNA of the claimed invention is very high when compared to that of dsHES and pcrHES.

This unexpected effect, as shown in Figure 4, is not obvious over the teachings of Grunert et al.

For the above-noted reasons, this rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is hereby requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KAMIYA et al.

By: 

William R. Schmidt, II
Registration No. 58,327
Attorney for Applicants

WRS/lc
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 22, 2008